

REMARKS

Claims 7 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033554 (Ayyagari) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0133415 (Rappaport). The rejections are traversed and it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention concerns a communication apparatus determining whether the communication apparatus and a controlled device are connected to each other via a predetermined transmission medium. In the invention, the communication apparatus first detects the controlled device from among a plurality of devices connected via a network and obtains an IP address for the controlled device. The communication apparatus then transmits a request for inquiring whether the controlled device having an obtained IP address is connected to the predetermined transmission medium, where the communication apparatus is directly connected to the predetermined transmission medium, and the request is transmitted via the predetermined transmission medium. If a response corresponding to the request is received from the controlled device, then the communication apparatus determines that the controlled device and the communication apparatus are connected via the predetermined transmission medium. On the other hand, if no response to the request is received from the controlled device, then the communication apparatus determines that the controlled device and the communication apparatus are connected via a transmission medium different from the predetermined transmission medium. In this latter case, warning information is displayed on a display unit.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 7 is directed to a communication apparatus capable of connecting to a network including a plurality of transmission media and capable of controlling a controlled device having a predetermined function, comprising a device detecting unit that (a) detects the controlled device among a plurality of devices connected to the network, and (b) obtains an IP address of the controlled device, a communication unit that transmits a request for inquiring whether the controlled device having the obtained IP address is connected to a predetermined transmission medium, the communication apparatus being directly connected to the predetermined transmission medium, the request being transmitted via the predetermined transmission medium, and a determining unit that (a) determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via the predetermined transmission medium, if a response corresponding to the request is received from the controlled device, and (b) determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a transmission medium different from the predetermined transmission medium, if no response to the request is received from the controlled device, wherein the communication apparatus displays warning information if the determining unit determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via the transmission medium different from the predetermined transmission medium.

Claims 11 and 15 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 7.

The applied art of Comp is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 7, 11 and 15, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the

features of a communication apparatus i) detecting a controlled device among a plurality of devices connected to the network and obtaining an IP address of the controlled device, and ii) determining that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a predetermined transmission medium, if a response corresponding to a request, transmitted via the predetermined communication medium, is received from the controlled device, and determining that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a transmission medium different from the predetermined transmission medium, if no response to the request is received from the controlled device.

Ayyagari is seen to disclose a proxy-bridge device that utilizes a protocol stack such that the proxy-bridge device is just another device in a piconet to other devices in the piconet. In this regard, the Office Action asserted that Ayyagari teaches that both devices are connected using two different protocols. However, the claimed invention does not recite determining whether the devices are connected using different protocols, but rather, recites that a determination is made whether the devices are connected via different transmission mediums.

The Office Action asserts that page 4, paragraphs [0042] & [0046] teach the second part of the claimed determination. Applicant wholly disagrees. In particular, paragraph [0042] states nothing at all about determining anything, much less determining that a communication apparatus and a controlled device are connected via a transmission medium different from a predetermined transmission medium if no response to a request packet is received. Rather, paragraph [0042] merely recites different types of networks that may be implemented in the system of Ayyagari, and different types of corresponding

protocols. Paragraph [0046] merely describes devices on the network connected to one another, and states that the devices may communicate with each other and the proxy-bridge device “over a common channel using a proprietary protocol different from the protocol used by the proxy-bridge device.” Thus, nowhere do the cited portions of Ayyagari teach the second part of the determination as claimed.

The Office Action also cites to page 7, paragraphs [0066] to [0070] as allegedly teaching the second part of the claimed determination. However, these paragraphs merely describe that, if the proxy-bridge device is polled whether it supports a requested service, and if the proxy-bridge device determines that it does not support the requested service, it queries other devices on the network. Thus, the cited portion of Ayyagari merely determines whether or not a requested service is supported, but does not determine whether the devices are connected using different protocols, but rather, recites that a determination is made whether the devices are connected via different transmission mediums.

Rappaport is seen to disclose a system that provides a display model of a communication network. Rappaport was merely cited for displaying a warning message. However, Rappaport, like Ayyagari, is not seen to teach anything that would have resulted in the features of a communication apparatus i) detecting a controlled device among a plurality of devices connected to the network and obtaining an IP address of the controlled device, and ii) determining that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a predetermined transmission medium, if a response corresponding to a request, transmitted via the predetermined communication medium, is received from the

controlled device, and determining that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a transmission medium different from the predetermined transmission medium, if no response to the request is received from the controlled device.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, Claims 7 to 18 are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 2871103v1